

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Reuben Yeroushalmi (SBN 193981)
Daniel D. Cho (SBN 105409)
Ben Yeroushalmi (SBN 232540)
YEROUSHALMI & ASSOCIATES
9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E
Beverly Hills, California 90212
Telephone: 310.623.1926

Telephone: 310.623.1926 Facsimile: 310.623.1930

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ENDORSED FILED San Francisco County Superior Court

FEB 0 8 2014

CLERK OF THE COURT

LEGLEY FISCELLA

Deputy Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONSUMER ADVOCACY GROUP, INC., in the public interest,

Plaintiff,

WIESNER PRODUCTS, INC., a New York Corporation, MYSTIC APPAREL LLC; and DOES 1-50.

Defendants.

CASE NO. CGC-12-521346

CONSENT JUDGMENT PR

Second Amended Complaint filed: August 23, 2013

BY FAX

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Consent Judgment is entered into by and between plaintiff Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc. ("CAG") acting on behalf of itself and in the interest of the public and defendants Wiesner Products, Inc. ("Wiesner") and Mystic Apparel, LLC ("Mystic Apparel"), with each a Party and collectively referred to as "Parties" and Wiesner and Mystic Apparel collectively referred to as "Defendants."
- 1.2 Wiesner employs ten or more persons, is a person in the course of doing business for purposes of the Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, California Health

CONSENT JUDGMENT (PROPOSED)

27 28

74673790 1 NW 6716 NWW

 & Safety Code §§ 25249.6 et seq. ("Proposition 65"), and manufactures, distributes, and sells Footwear, Children's Slippers, Rene Rofe Sandals, and Children's Sandals. Mystic Apparel employs ten or more persons, is a person in the course of doing business for the purposes of Proposition 65, and manufactures, distributes and sells Bath Mats.

1.3 Notices of Violation.

- 1.3.1 On or about June 7, 2011, CAG served Wiesner, Hasbro, Inc. and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "June 7, 2011 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to di-butyl phthalate (DBP) contained in Children's Slippers.
- 1.3.2 On or about December 5, 2011, CAG served Wiesner, Big Lots Stores, Inc., Big Lots, Inc., Big Lots!, International Intimates dba Rene Rofe and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "December 5, 2011 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to di-butyl phthalate (DBP) contained in Rene Rofe Sandals.
- 1.3.3 On or about March 6, 2012, CAG served Wiesner, International Intimates dba Rene Rofe and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "March 6, 2012 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DBP and Di (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) contained in Footwear.
- 1.3.4 On or about March 6, 2012, CAG served Wiesner, Big Lots, Inc., Big Lots Stores, Inc. and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "March 6, 2012 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn

individuals in California of exposures to Di n-Hexyl Phthlate (DNHP) contained in Footwear.

1.3.5 On or about April 23, 2012, CAG served Wiesner, Viacom, Inc., Burlington Coat Factory Warehouse Corporation and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "April 23, 2012 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DBP contained in Children's Sandals.

1.3.6 On or about May 3, 2013, CAG served Mystic Apparel and various public enforcement agencies with a document entitled "60-Day Notice of Violation" (the "May 3, 2013 Notice") that provided the recipients with notice of alleged violations of Health & Safety Code § 25249.6 for failing to warn individuals in California of exposures to DEHP contained in Bath Mats.

1.3.7 No public enforcer has commenced or diligently prosecuted the allegations set forth in the June 7, 2011, December 5, 2011, March 6, 2012, April 23, 2012, and May 3, 2013 Notices.

1.4 Complaint.

On June 7, 2012, CAG filed a Complaint for civil penalties and injunctive relief in San Francisco Superior Court, Case No.CGC-12-521346 as to the Footwear products. On February 20, 2013, CAG filed a First Amended Complaint. On August 23, 2013, CAG filed a Second Amended Complaint ("Complaint"). The Complaint alleges, among other things, that Wiesner violated Proposition 65 by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to DEHP, DBP, and DNHP (hereinafter "Noticed Chemicals"), and that Mystic Apparel violated Proposition 65 by failing to give clear and reasonable warnings of exposure to DEHP.

1.5 Consent to Jurisdiction

For purposes of this Consent Judgment only, the parties stipulate that this Court has



 jurisdiction over the allegations of violations contained in the Complaint and personal jurisdiction over Wiesner and Mystic Apparel as to the acts alleged in the Complaint, that venue is proper in the City and County of San Francisco and that this Court has jurisdiction to enter this Consent Judgment as a full settlement and resolution of the allegations contained in the Complaint and of all claims which were or could have been raised by any person or entity based in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, on the facts alleged therein or arising therefrom or related to.

1.6 No Admission

This Consent Judgment resolves claims that are denied and disputed. The parties enter into this Consent Judgment pursuant to a full and final settlement of any and all claims between the parties for the purpose of avoiding prolonged litigation. This Consent Judgment shall not constitute an admission with respect to any material allegation of the Complaint, each and every allegation of which Wiesner and Mystic Apparel deny, nor may this Consent Judgment or compliance with it be used as evidence of any wrongdoing, misconduct, culpability or liability on the part of Wiesner or Mystic Apparel.

2. DEFINITIONS

- 2.1 "Covered Products" means Footwear, Children's Slippers, Children's Sandals, and Rene Rofe Sandals manufactured, distributed, sold or offered for sale by Wiesner, and Bath Mats manufactured, distributed, sold or offered for sale by Mystic Apparel.
- 2.2 "Effective Date" means the date that this Consent Judgment is entered by the Court.

3. INJUNCTIVE RELIEF/REFORMULATION

3.1 Within 30 days of the Effective Date Wiesner and Mystic Apparel shall not sell or offer for sale in California Covered Products that contain the Noticed Chemicals with more than 0.1% by weight.

 4.1 Reimbursement of Attorneys' Fees and Costs: Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date, Defendants shall pay a total of eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000) to "Yeroushalmi & Associates" as reimbursement for the investigation fees and costs, testing costs, expert fees, attorney fees, and other litigation costs and expenses for all work performed through the approval of this Consent Judgment.

- 4.2 Civil Penalties. Within ten (10) days of the Effective Date. Defendants shall issue two separate checks for a total amount of four thousand dollars (\$4,000): \$4,000 as penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code § 25249.12: (a) one check made payable to the State of California's Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) in the amount of \$3,000 representing 75% of the total penalty; and (b) one check to Consumer Advocacy Group. Inc. in the amount of \$1,000 representing 25% of the total penalty. Two separate 1099s shall be issued for the above payments: The first 1099 shall be issued to OEHHA, P.O. Box 4010. Sacramento, CA 95184 (EIN: 68-0284486) in the amount of \$3,000. The second 1099 shall be issued in the amount of \$1,000 to CAG and delivered to: Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, California 90212.
- Defendants shall pay a total of \$1,000 in lieu of civil penalties to "Consumer Advocacy Group. Inc." CAG will use this payment for investigation of the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals through various means, laboratory fees for testing for Proposition 65 listed chemicals, expert fees for evaluating exposures through various mediums, including but not limited to consumer product, occupational, and environmental exposures to Proposition 65 listed chemicals, and the administrative and litigation costs and fees (excluding attorneys' fees), the cost of hiring consulting and retained experts who assist with the extensive scientific analysis necessary for those files in litigation, in order to reduce the public's exposure to Proposition 65 listed chemicals by notifying those persons and/or entities believed to be responsible for such

8

11

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21 22

23

26 27

28

24 25 exposures and attempting to persuade those persons and/or entities to reformulate their products or the source of exposure to completely eliminate or lower the level of Proposition 65 listed chemicals, thereby addressing the same public harm as allegedly in the instant Action. Further should the court require it, CAG will submit under seal, an accounting of these funds as described above as to how the funds were used. The check shall be made payable to "Consumer Advocacy Group, Inc." and delivered to Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, California 90212.

4.4 Other than the payment to OEHHA identified in Section 4.2, payments shall be delivered to: Reuben Yeroushalmi, Yeroushalmi & Associates, 9100 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 610E, Beverly Hills, CA 90212.

5. MATTERS COVERED BY THIS CONSENT JUDGMENT

- This Consent Judgment is a full, final, and binding resolution between CAG on behalf of itself and in the public interest and Defendants Wiesner and Mystic Apparel and their officers, directors, insurers, employees, parents, shareholders, divisions, subdivisions subsidiaries, partners, affiliates, sister companies and their successors and assigns ("Defendant Releasees"), including but not limited to each of its suppliers, customers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers, licensors, licensees, or any other person in the course of doing business and the successors and assigns of any of them, who may use, maintain, distribute or sell Covered Products ("Downstream Defendant Releasees"), for all claims for violations of Proposition 65 up through the Effective Date based on exposure to the Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products as set forth in the Notices. Wiesner, Mystic Apparel and Defendant Releasees' compliance with this Consent Judgment shall constitute compliance with Proposition 65 with respect to the Noticed Chemicals in Defendants' Covered Products.
- 5.2 CAG on behalf of itself, its past and current agents, representatives, attorneys, successors, and/or assignees, hereby waives all rights to institute or participate in, directly of indirectly, any form of legal action and releases all claims, including, without limitation, all

actions, and causes of action, in law or in equity, suits, liabilities, demands, obligations, damages, costs, fines, penalties, losses, or expenses (including, but not limited to, investigation fees, expert fees, and attorneys' fees) of any nature whatsoever, whether known or unknown, fixed or contingent (collectively "Claims"), against Wiesner, Mystic Apparel, Defendant Releasees, and Downstream Defendant Releasees arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products manufactured, distributed, or sold by Wiesner, Mystic Apparel and Defendant Releasees. In furtherance of the foregoing, as to alleged exposures to Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products, CAG hereby waives any and all rights and benefits which it now has, or in the future may have, conferred upon it with respect to the Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products by virtue of the provisions of section 1542 of the California Civil Code, which provides as follows:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS WHICH THE CREDITOR DOES NOT KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS FAVOR AT THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE, WHICH IF KNOWN BY HIM, MUST HAVE MATERIALLY AFFECTED HIS SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR.

CAG understands and acknowledges that the significance and consequence of this waiver of California Civil Code section 1542 is that even if CAG suffers future damages arising out of or resulting from, or related directly or indirectly to, in whole or in part, the Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about exposure to Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products, including but not limited to any exposure to, or failure to warn with respect to exposure to Noticed Chemicals from the Covered Products, CAG will not be able to make any claim for those damages against Wiesner or the Defendant Releasees or Downstream Defendant Releasees. Furthermore, CAG acknowledges that it intends these consequences for any such Claims arising from any violation of Proposition 65 or any other statutory or common law regarding the failure to warn about

exposure to Noticed Chemicals from Covered Products as may exist as of the date of this release but which CAG does not know exist, and which, if known, would materially affect their decision to enter into this Consent Judgment, regardless of whether their lack of knowledge is the result of ignorance, oversight, error, negligence, or any other cause.

6. ENFORCEMENT OF JUDGMENT

- 6.1 The terms of this Consent Judgment shall be enforced exclusively by the parties hereto. The parties may, by noticed motion or order to show cause before the Superior Court of California, City and County of San Francisco, giving the notice required by law, enforce the terms and conditions contained herein. A Party may enforce any of the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment only after that Party first provides 30 days' notice to the Party allegedly failing to comply with the terms and conditions of this Consent Judgment and attempts to resolve such Party's failure to comply in an open and good faith manner.
- 6.2 Notice of Violation. Prior to bringing any motion, order to show cause, or other proceeding to enforce Section 3.1 of this Consent Judgment, CAG shall provide a Notice of Violation ("NOV") to Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel. The NOV shall include for each of the Covered Products: the date(s) the alleged violation(s) was observed and the location at which the Covered Products were offered for sale, and shall be accompanied by all test data obtained by CAG regarding the Covered Products, including an identification of the component(s) of the Covered Products that were tested.
 - 6.2.1 Non-Contested NOV. CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation if, within 30 days of receiving such NOV, Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel serves a Notice of Election ("NOE") that meets one of the following conditions:
 - (a) The Covered Products were shipped by Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel for sale in California before the Effective Date, or
 - (b) Since receiving the NOV Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel has taken corrective action by either (i) requesting that its customers in California remove the

Covered Products identified in the NOV from sale in California and destroy or return the Covered Products to Defendant, or (ii) providing a clear and reasonable warning for the Covered Products identified in the NOV pursuant to 27 Cal. Code Regs. § 25603.

- 6.2.2 Contested NOV. Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel may serve an NOE informing CAG of its election to contest the NOV within 30 days of receiving the NOV.
- (a) In the election, Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel may request that the sample(s) Covered Products tested by CAG be subject to confirmatory testing at an EPA-accredited laboratory.
- (b) If the confirmatory testing establishes that the Covered Products do not contain Noticed Chemicals in excess of the level allowed in Section 3.1 CAG shall take no further action regarding the alleged violation. If the testing does not establish compliance with Section 3.1, Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel may withdraw its NOE to contest the violation and may serve a new NOE pursuant to Section 6.2.1.
- (c) If Wiesner and/or Mystic Apparel does not withdraw an NOE to contest the NOV, the Parties shall meet and confer for a period of no less than 30 days before CAG may seek an order enforcing the terms of this Consent Judgment.
- 6.3 In any proceeding brought by either Party to enforce this Consent Judgment, such party may seek whatever fines, costs, penalties or remedies as may be provided by law for any violation of Proposition 65 or this Consent Judgment.

7. ENTRY OF CONSENT JUDGMENT

- 7.1 CAG shall file a motion seeking approval of this Consent Judgment pursuant to California Health & Safety Code § 25249.7(f). Upon entry of the Consent Judgment, CAG and Defendants waive their respective rights to a hearing or trial on the allegations of the Complaint.
- 7.2 If this Consent Judgment is not approved by the Court, (a) this Consent Judgment and any and all prior agreements between the parties merged herein shall terminate and become null and void, and the actions shall revert to the status that existed prior to the execution date of

this Consent Judgment; (b) no term of this Consent Judgment or any draft thereof, or of the negotiation, documentation, or other part or aspect of the Parties' settlement discussions, shall have any effect, nor shall any such matter be admissible in evidence for any purpose in this Action, or in any other proceeding; and (c) the Parties agree to meet and confer to determine whether to modify the terms of the Consent Judgment and to resubmit it for approval.

8. MODIFICATION OF JUDGMENT

- 8.1 This Consent Judgment may be modified only upon written agreement of the parties and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court thereon, or upon motion of any party as provided by law and upon entry of a modified Consent Judgment by the Court.
- 8.2 Any Party seeking to modify this Consent Judgment shall attempt in good faith to meet and confer with the other Party prior to filing a motion to modify the Consent Judgment.

9. RETENTION OF JURISDICTION

9.1 This Court shall retain jurisdiction of this matter to implement and enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

10. DUTIES LIMITED TO CALIFORNIA

This Consent Judgment shall have no effect on Covered Products sold outside the State of California.

11. SERVICE ON THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

11.1 CAG shall serve a copy of this Consent Judgment, signed by both parties, on the California Attorney General so that the Attorney General may review this Consent Judgment prior to its submittal to the Court for approval. Further, CAG will file the Motion to Approve the Consent Judgment and will provide the Attorney General with at least forty-five (45) days notice of that Motion.

12. ATTORNEY FEES

12.1 Except as specifically provided in Section 4, each Party shall bear its own costs and attorney fees in connection with this action.

13. ENTIRE AGREEMENT

13.1 This Consent Judgment contains the sole and entire agreement and understanding of the parties with respect to the entire subject matter hereof and any and all prior discussions, negotiations, commitments and understandings related hereto. No representations, oral or otherwise, express or implied, other than those contained herein have been made by any party hereto. No other agreements not specifically referred to herein, oral or otherwise, shall be deemed to exist or to bind any of the parties.

14. GOVERNING LAW

- 14.1 The validity, construction and performance of this Consent Judgment shall be governed by the laws of the State of California.
- 14.2 In the event that Proposition 65 is repealed, preempted, or is otherwise rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally, or if any of the provisions of this Consent Judgment are rendered inapplicable or are no longer required as a result of any such repeal or preemption, or rendered inapplicable by reason of law generally as to the Covered Products, then either Defendant may provide written notice to CAG of any asserted change in the law, and shall have no further obligations pursuant to this Consent Judgment with respect to, and to the extent that, the Covered Products are so affected. Nothing in this Consent Judgment shall be interpreted to relieve a Defendant from any obligation to comply with any pertinent state or federal law or regulation.
- 14.3 The Parties, including their counsel, have participated in the preparation of this Consent Judgment and this Consent Judgment is the result of the joint efforts of the Parties. This Consent Judgment was subject to revision and modification by the Parties and has been accepted and approved as to its final form by all Parties and their counsel. Accordingly, any uncertainty or ambiguity existing in this Consent Judgment shall not be interpreted against any Party as a result of the manner of the preparation of this Consent Judgment. Each Party to this Consent Judgment agrees that any statute or rule of construction providing that ambiguities are to be

CONSENT JUDGMENT IPROPOS

500 Capitol Mall, Suite 1600

Secremento, CA 95814 2 AUTHORITY TO STIPULATE 3 17.1 Each signatory to this Consent Judgment certifies that he or she is fully authorized by the party he or she represents to enter into this Consent Judgment and to execute it on behalf of the party represented and legally to bind that party. AGREED TO: AGREED TO: Date: 10-14-13 9 10 11 Defendant, WIESNER PRODUCTS, INC. PHINTE CONSUMER ADVOCACY 12 GROUP, INC. 13 AGREED TO 14 15 16 17 Defendant MYSTIC APPAREL, LLC 18 19 20 IT IS SO ORDERED. 21 A. Jangko Pobertskin. II FEB 03 2014 22 Date: 23 JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT 24 25 26 27 28

146737289.] **604**5216-6**00**07